

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DERRICK JAMES PARRA,

Defendant and Appellant.

B203644

(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. VA099916)

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County, Yvonne T. Sanchez, Judge. Affirmed.

Derrick James Parra, in pro. per., and Maureen L. Fox, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

Derrick Parra entered a negotiated plea of no contest to assault by means of force likely to produce great bodily injury and was sentenced to the low term of two years in state prison. The plea was based on a February 11, 2007 incident in which defendant became enraged as a result of a family argument, forced his way into his sister's room, threw furniture at his sister and bit her, breaking the skin. In exchange for the plea, the prosecutor did not pursue the assault as an offense under the "Three Strikes" law and a prior conviction allegation was dismissed. In the same proceeding, defendant admitted a probation violation and was sentenced to a concurrent term on that offense.

Defendant filed a timely notice of appeal and we appointed counsel to represent him. On March 10, 2008, counsel filed a brief in which no issues were raised. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441–442.) On March 12 we sent letters to defendant and to appointed counsel in which we directed counsel immediately to forward the appellate record to defendant and informed defendant that within 30 days he could personally submit any contentions or issues that he wished us to consider. Counsel later forwarded to us a letter she had received from defendant which appeared to have been mailed to her on March 23 and which she believed defendant had intended to serve as his supplemental brief. In the letter, defendant refers to his plea and sentencing but does not raise any contentions or issues that we can discern.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that defendant's counsel has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Kelly* (2006) 40 Cal.4th 106, 109–110; *People v. Wende, supra*, 25 Cal.3d at p. 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED.

MALLANO, Acting P. J.

We concur:

VOGEL, J.

ROTHSCHILD, J.